



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : **Confirmation No. 2601**  
Mitsuaki OSHIMA et al. : Attorney Docket No. 2000\_1326  
Serial No. 09/669,916 : Group Art Unit 2634  
Filed September 25, 2000 : Examiner Dac V. Ha  
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM : **Mail Stop: RCE**

---

**RESPONSE**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED  
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE  
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT  
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

Sir:

This paper is in response to the Office Action mailed February 3, 2006. The period for response is extended herein by three months to August 3, 2006.

On February 3, 2002, a Final Office Action was mailed in the present application wherein all of the claims (claims 39-54) were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsinberg in view of Tanaka.

Thereafter, on March 23, 2006, a personal interview was conducted between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney. A copy of the Interview Summary of the March 23, 2006 interview is enclosed herewith. It is requested that the Examiner make the Interview Summary of record in the present application.

During the interview, applicants' representative presented arguments, which are set forth below, pointing out how the present claims are distinguishable over the applied prior art. As a result of the discussion, and as stated by the Examiner on the Interview Summary, an agreement was reached that the applied prior art is overcome by the arguments. See page 2 of the Interview Summary.

Applicants' representative presented the following arguments during the interview: